

REMARKS

Claims 1-68 are pending and at issue in this application, with claims 1, 17, 32 and 45 being independent claims. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Each of independent claims 1, 17, 32 and 45 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Hornik, et al (U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0152509, hereinafter "Hornik"). Independent claim 1, for example, is generally directed to a gaming method for facilitating game play via a gaming apparatus having first and second display units. Claim 1 now recites, in part, causing the first display unit to display a first game display relating to one of the following games: poker, blackjack, slots, keno or bingo, and selecting one of a plurality of player input displays, the one player input display corresponding to the one game related to the first game display, and causing the second display unit to display the selected one of the plurality of player input displays.

Hornik does not anticipate amended claim 1 because Hornik fails to disclose all of the recited limitations and, in particular, fails to disclose "selecting one of a plurality of player input displays, the one player input display corresponding to the one game related to the first game display." Hornik describes a primary device having a display for displaying games being played on separate gaming devices that are linked to the primary gaming device. Thus, the system described in Hornik allows a player of the primary gaming device to participate in the game of the primary gaming device on a primary display, and in games being played on the other gaming devices on the secondary display (see Hornik, paras. [0027]-[0028]). In Hornik, the secondary display is not used for playing games that are displayed on the primary display. Rather, the display on the secondary display is totally unrelated to the game shown on the primary display. Thus, Hornik does not disclose or suggest a secondary display for displaying "one of a plurality of player input displays, the one player input display corresponding to the one game related to the first game

display,” as recited in claim 1. For at least these reasons, Hornik does not anticipate amended independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Applicants respectfully submit that each of independent claims 17, 32, and 45 is allowable at least for reasons similar to those described above with respect to amended independent claim 1, and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Claims 2-16, 18-31, 33-44 and 46-68 each depend from one of independent claims 1, 17, 32 or 45. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that each of these claims is allowable for at least the reasons above, and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance for the reasons provided above. This response is timely filed as it is accompanied by a petition for a one-month extension of time and a check for the requisite fee therefore, thereby extending the response date to August 6, 2007. Although Applicants believe that no other fees or petitions are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 13-2855 of Marshall, Gerstein & Borun, LLP under Order No. 29757/P-892.

Should the examiner wish to discuss any of the foregoing comments or any claim amendments deemed needed to result in allowance, applicants kindly request the examiner to contact the undersigned by telephone at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 1, 2007

By: 

Gregory E. Stanton

Registration No.: 45,127

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300

Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Attorney for Applicants